## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

RONNIE MOORE,	) CASE NO.1:11CV2334
Plaintiff,	JUDGE CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO
Vs.	)
HOUSEHOLD REALTY CORP.	) ORDER
Defendant.	<i>)</i> )

## CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO, J:

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Affidavit of Notice of Failure to Timely Respond and Notary Complaint in Admiralty (ECF # 8). According to Defendant, pro se Plaintiff's Complaint was dismissed on January 9, 2012, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff subsequently filed his Affidavit of Notice of Failure to Timely Respond and Notary Complaint on March 2, 2012. Plaintiff's filing and its intent are difficult, if not impossible, to decipher. Plaintiff appears to request responses from Defendant to certain unspecified questions dating back to an underlying state foreclosure proceeding. Defendant moves the Court to strike this Notice under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) which states:

f) Motion to Strike. The court may strike from a pleading an insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter. The court may act:

Case: 1:11-cv-02334-CAB Doc #: 9 Filed: 04/19/12 2 of 2. PageID #: 60

(1) on its own; or

(2) on motion made by a party either before responding to the pleading or, if a response is not allowed, within 21 days after being served with the pleading.

Because Rule 12(f) is limited to pleadings, it is not an appropriate vehicle for striking

non-pleadings, including motions or notices. See Porter v. Hamilton Beach/Proctor-Silex, Inc.,

No. 01-2970, unreported, 2003 WL 21946595 \*2 (W.D. Tenn. July 28, 2003). Therefore, the

Court denies Defendant's Motion. However, the Court does note that Plaintiff's Notice,

whatever it purports to be, is of no legal effect since Plaintiff's claims have already been

dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Christopher A. Boyko CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO United States District Judge

April 19, 2012